REMARKS

The Abstract has been amended in view of the objection thereto.

The specification has again been objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(a) with respect to the Amendment filed 9/8/03 which states, in part, "The main body is formed with a first, a second, and a third paper transport paths for discharging the recording paper and paper fed from the multipurpose feeding unit assembly, the feeding cassette and the optional device, respectively."

Apparently, the Examiner in not familiar with the term "respectively." The term "respectively" means that the sentence should be interpreted as stating, --The main body is formed with a first paper transport path for discharging the recording paper and paper fed from the multipurpose feeding unit assembly, a second paper transport path for discharging the recording paper and paper fed from the feeding cassette, and a third paper transport path for discharging the recording paper and paper fed from the optional device.--

The use of the term "respectively" allows the above sentence to be shortened, as represented by the amendment of 9/8/03. The optional device is defined by the specification to be element 12 or 12'.

Accordingly, the objection to the specification, and Abstract, in this regard should be withdrawn.

Claims 23, 26 and 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph based upon a number of deficiencies kindly noted by the Examiner. Accordingly the above

amendment is believed to correct for those deficiencies not discussed below.

Claim 23 was rejected to due to the phrase "said openings" in line 5 apparently lacking proper antecedent basis. Proper antecedent basis is established by the feature *a plurality of openings through said first and second cover plates* in line 3 of claim 23. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as rendered obvious and unpatentable, over Arai '828 in view of Muto '290 and Tominaga (JP 10-324435) as shown by Gonidec '476, Yokota et al. '896, Nagasawa et al. '714 and Jones et al. '418. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reason(s).

In determining the differences between the Applicant's invention and the applied art, and in particular the Arai device, the Examiner holds that such differences are the features of *a main body having an optional auxiliary device located at a first side thereof* and *an elastic member attached between said first cover plate and said base unit.*

The Applicant contends that Arai also differs from the present invention by failing to teach, at least *a feeding unit for feeding sheets of recording paper, located at a second side of the main body*. In this regard, the Examiner holds the sheet feeding unit 4 of Arai to correspond to the claimed *feeding unit*. Arai teaches that sheet supply unit 4 is furnished **in** the bottom portion of the copying machine main body 1.

Accordingly, the feeding unit 4 in Arai is not *located at a second side of the main body*, but

is instead in the main body at a bottom portion thereof.

Additionally, Arai fails to teach *a feeding unit assembly removably mounted at a central portion of the main body, for transporting the sheets of recording paper from said second side towards said first side via a first paper transport path.*

Here, the Examiner does not directly refer us to any of Arai's elements, but it appears that the Examiner discussion regarding a "sheet jam removal device in a feeding unit assembly" is an attempt to hold that such a "sheet jam removal device in a feeding unit assembly" corresponds to the claimed *feeding unit assembly*. In this discussion, the Examiner refers to elements 32, 33, 45, 50, 51, etc. of the "sheet jam removal device."

Elements 32, 33, 45, 50, 51, etc. are disclosed in Arai as parts of a dual-sided copying section 20 comprised in a main frame 30. Dual-sided copying section 20 enables sheets of recording paper to be printed on both sides. Arai discusses the operation when a sheet jam occurs in a dual-sided copying section 20 in col. 9, lines 19+.

Now, looking to Arai's further, we find disclosed therein a sheet feeding unit 12 disclosed as feeding sheets of paper from one of the trays in feeding unit 4 to the image-forming unit 11. Accordingly, considering the Examiner's holding that feeding unit 4 corresponds to the claimed *feeding unit for feeding sheets of recording paper, located at a second side of the main body*, it is Arai's sheet feeding unit 12 that transports the sheets of recording paper from *said second side* towards a first side, *i.e.*, sheet discharge tray 5 for receiving copier-processed sheets discharged from the left portion of machine main body 1, via a first paper transport path.

In order for dual-sided copying section 20 to enables sheets of recording paper to be printed

on both sides, a once printed on sheet of paper if fed from the image-forming unit 11 to dual-sided copying section 20. That is, the paper in dual-sided copying section 20 does not come from feeding unit 4 (*said second side*), but instead, comes from a fixing unit 14.

That is dual-sided copying section 20 receives paper from fixing unit 14 and feeds that paper to image forming unit 14 via sheet feeding unit 12. Sheet feeding unit 12 is not *removably mounted at a central portion of the main body* 1.

Accordingly, dual-sided copying section 20 (the Examiner's "sheet jam removal device in a feeding unit assembly") does not correspond to the claimed *feeding unit assembly removably mounted at a central portion of the main body, for transporting the sheets of recording paper from said second side towards said first side via a first paper transport path.*

Further, claim 20 requires that the feeding unit assembly comprise *a base unit having a first plurality of feed rollers for feeding said sheets of recording paper along said first paper transport path.* Here, the Examiner refer us to Arai's lower conveyor 32 as corresponding to the *base unit.* Lower conveyor 32 comprises a lower conveying guide 45 and three lower convey rollers 46, 46, 46a rotatably supported on the lower conveying guide 45.

Convey rollers 46, 46, 46a, however, do not have the function of *feeding said sheets of recording paper along said first paper transport path.* As discussed above, the *first paper transport path* is disposed within Arai's sheet feeding unit 12, because sheet feeding unit 12 that transports the sheets of recording paper from *said second side* towards a first side, *i.e.,* sheet discharge tray 5 for receiving copier-processed sheets discharged from the left portion of machine main body 1, via a first paper transport path.

Arai discloses that rollers 46, 46, run transverse to the conveyance direction. Col. 8, lines 14-15. The "conveyance direction" in Arai being defined in col. 7, lines 13-26.

Accordingly, Arai fails to teach *a base unit having a first plurality of feed rollers for feeding said sheets of recording paper along said first paper transport path.*

Additionally, Arai's first cover plate 33 does not correspond to the claimed *first cover plate rotatably positioned over said first paper transport path, a first end of said first cover plate being rotatable about a hinge shaft*, because the *first paper transport path* in Arai is disposed within Arai's sheet feeding unit 12, as discussed above.

That brings us to the feature of *an elastic member attached between said first cover plate and said base unit* noted by the Examiner as not being taught by Arai.

Here, the Examiner refers us to tension spring 18 in Tominaga, and provides a unsupported statement (based on speculation, it appears) that "there is a problem with manufacturing the linkage [34] of Arai due to the fact that it requires many components or features . . . The manufacturing of this linkage can be costly."

Deficiencies in the factual basis cannot be supplied by resorting to speculation or unsupported generalities. *In re Warner*, 379 F.2d 1011, 154 USPQ 173 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Freed*, 425 F.2d 785, 165 USPQ 570 (CCPA 1970).

The Examiner attempts to support the holding that "there is a problem with manufacturing the linkage [34] of Arai due to the fact that it requires many components or features . . ." by referring us to Nagasawa et al. which discusses a complicated link mechanism in U.S. Patent No. 4,639,126.,

and its apparent "high cost."

Looking to Arai, linkage 34 is an important component of Arai's invention as evidenced by Arai's claim 1, for example, which calls for a first linkage, one end of said first linkage being pivotably supported on one of the upper and lower conveying guides, and an opposite end of said first linkage being engaged with the other of said upper and lower conveying guides; wherein said first linkage is configured **such that the two conveying guides turn linked and spaced at predetermined intervals and lock at the predetermined intervals**.

Arai teaches that "when the upper and lower conveying sections subsequently turn into predetermined spaced intervals, both sections lock at predetermined intervals due to the configuration of the first link member. In this situation, the upper conveying section will not fall back to its original position though the hand is taken away from the upper conveying section. It is therefore easy single-handedly to clear sheets jammed between either section. When the upper conveying section is further lifted and turned, due to the locking engagement of both sections by means of the first link member, the lower conveying section turns linked with the upper conveying section, such that the area over the sheet storing section is opened. Therefore, if a sheet jam occurs in the sheet storing section, access to clear the jammed sheet is merely by turning open the upper conveying section."

The Examiner provides no evidence that using a tension spring [18] instead of Arai's linkage 34 would result in the upper and lower conveying guides being **linked and spaced at predetermined intervals and lock at the predetermined intervals** as desired by Arai.

Accordingly, replacement of Arai's linkage 34 with a tension spring would destroy the intended purpose of Arai's device such that it would no longer be able to function as intended, and

such destruction is an important indication of non-obviousness, see *In re Gordon,* 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

None of the references applied in the rejection teach that replacement of Arai's linkage 34 with a tension spring would not destroy the intended purpose of Arai's device.

Accordingly, for each of the foregoing reasons, the rejection of claim 20 is deemed to be in error and should be withdrawn.

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as rendered obvious and unpatentable, over Arai '828 in view of Muto '290 and Tominaga (JP 10-324435) as shown by Gonidec '476, Yokota et al. '896, Nagasawa et al. '714 and Jones et al. '418 as applied to claim 20, and in further view of Ogata '567. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reason(s).

Claim 26 depends from claim 20 and is deemed to be patentable over the applied art for the reasons stated above, because Ogata fails to teach the features of claim 20 deemed not to be taught by Arai '828 in view of Muto '290, Tominaga (JP 10-324435), Gonidec '476, Yokota et al. '896, Nagasawa et al. '714 and Jones et al. '418.

Accordingly, the rejection of claim 26 is deemed to be in error and should be withdrawn.

The indications of allowable subject matter with respect to claims 21-25 and 27-36 is

appreciated.

The examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, withdraw the objections and/or rejections and pass the application to issue in view of the above amendments and/or remarks.

Should a Petition for extension of time be required with the filing of this Amendment, the Commissioner is kindly requested to treat this paragraph as such a request and is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 02-4943 of Applicant's undersigned attorney in the amount of the incurred fee if, **and only if**, a petition for extension of time be required **and** a check of the requisite amount is not enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert E. Bushnell
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 27,774

1522 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 638-5740

Folio: P56132
Date: 2/23/04
I.D.: REB/MDP